

are to be applied? Is the money of the people to be used in efforts to debauch and bribe weak-minded men into a support of Lincoln's infamous and wicked war? Is this the way he is to get his soldiers in Kentucky? The people have a right to know what their money is spent for.

**TAX PAYER**



TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.  
Daily Courier for one year, \$5.00  
Daily Courier for six months, \$3.00  
Daily Courier for three months, \$1.50  
Daily Courier for one month, \$0.50  
Single copies, 10 cents each.  
No paper sent unless paid for in advance.

LOUISVILLE.  
MONDAY MORNING, AUGUST 26.

Kentucky and Tennessee.

The Lincoln organs are engaged in a most criminal effort to ensnare Kentucky in the war with the State of Tennessee. To accomplish this purpose, misrepresentation and falsehood are resorted to, and every effort is daily being made to influence the minds of our people against Tennessee, not on account of any actual aggression, but because of some imaginary and unreliable outrage committed upon some imaginary or unreliable personage. Extraneous accounts are published of outrages upon Union men in East Tennessee. It is asserted that they have been driven from their homes by the Secessionists and that property confiscated. These statements are all without the slightest shadow of foundation. It is true that so-called Union men have left East Tennessee, but they were not compelled to do so. So far from being injured either in their person or property, General Zollicoffer, in East Tennessee, has issued a proclamation, enjoining a most scrupulous regard for the personal and property rights of all the inhabitants. "No act or word," he says, "will be tolerated calculated to alarm or irritate those who, through heretofore advancing the Federal Union, now acquiesce in the decision of the State." "Such of the people as have fled from their homes, under an apprehension of danger, will be encouraged to return, with an assurance of entire security to all who wish to pursue their respective avocations peacefully at home."

The Legislature of Tennessee, at its recent session, exercised towards East Tennessee a like spirit of forbearance and moderation—striving to bring the people back by a resort to conciliatory rather than by a resort to irritating coercive measures.

The same scrupulous regard for peace and unity which has marked the action of Tennessee towards the Union men of that State, has characterized her policy towards Kentucky. Tennessee has, in good faith, respected the neutrality of the State; even after, in the opinion of many, it has been repeatedly violated by the Lincoln Government. There are, it is true, many causes of irritation: the occupation of Columbus by Federal troops; the seizure of the steamer Terry; the arrest of citizens of Ballard county; the encampment of Lincoln soldiers in Garrard—all in direct and palpable violation of Kentucky's neutrality. But, what the Federal Government has thus wantonly disregarded the neutral position of Kentucky, the authorities of Tennessee have studiously refrained from doing so. So scrupulously does Tennessee respect the position of Kentucky, that the Confederate troops, stationed at Cumberland Gap, as we are reliably informed, are not permitted even to shake their thirst from Kentucky springs.

But, notwithstanding the forbearance exercised by Tennessee towards the Union men of that State, and notwithstanding her scrupulous respect for the neutrality of Kentucky, the leaders of the so-called Union party are seeking to ensnare the State in war with Tennessee.

This movement of the Union party is well understood. It is supposed, if hostilities can be provoked between Kentucky and Tennessee, that it may have a tendency to build up a strong Lincoln party in the State, which, with assistance from the Federal Government, may be sufficiently powerful to keep our State in the Union. The leaders of the party are becoming desperate; they see that unless held in check by a military force, as Maryland is now held in subjugation, that Kentucky, will speedily unite her destinies with the South. Hence, the strenuous efforts to inaugurate war with Tennessee; hence, the policy of the administration to send Gen. Anderson to the State to assume command of the Military Department of Cumberland. It is well known that should Kentucky permit Anderson to assume command of the Federal forces now in the State, that Tennessee will no longer respect the neutrality of Kentucky, which will then, if it has not already, cease to exist.

The programme of the leaders of the Union party is well defined: It is to make Kentucky "actively loyal." The Louisville Journal declares that Kentucky will not permit the "patriotic" States of the North to bear the burdens of the great contest now being waged for the maintenance of the government; that it is willing to bear her full proportion. If this be so, Kentucky is no longer neutral; but, as Lincoln's ally, she is in his war of subjugation against the South, then it is the emphatic folly to suppose that Tennessee will hesitate to march her troops upon Kentucky soil, and meet the hordes of Lincoln wherever they can be found. Kentucky has proclaimed to the world that in this contest between the North and the South she stands neutral. By maintaining that position peace may be preserved; by abandoning it war is inevitable. It is with the people to determine what course shall be pursued.

The Journal Handcuff Editorial.

The creditable indifference of editorials in the Louisville Journal and other thirty-two thousand handbills weigh thirty-two thousand pounds. It also says it would "take forty wagons to carry them."

The above conclusion is cyphered out by assuming "light hundred pounds as a wagon load." Now, if the editor will take the time, or trouble, to inquire, he will find out that a wagon load on such wagons as went with the Grand Army, was four or five tons. For instance, the Parrott gun, that great thirty-two pounder. It certainly weighed four tons, and if four tons is a wagon load, there was only four wagon loads of handbills.

The Journal's cyphering was intended to disparage the handbill story of the Grand Army, by trying to make it appear that forty wagons would be required to carry the handbills, instead of three, as reported. The huge conestoga wagons in the train of the Grand Army were drawn by four, six, eight, and some by as many as twelve horses, and of course they were heavily laden. Teams in this city have hauled five tons at a load, and it is a rare thing that a two horse drive to haul less than two thousand four hundred pounds.

The leaders of the Union party have professed to favor neutrality, are now preparing to abandon that position. It is, however, by no means certain that a majority of the Union party will follow their leaders.

Crushing Treason Satisfactorily.

The news of the destruction of the Eastern Sentinel and West Chester Freeman in battle here is evidence of the determination of the masses to crush out treason wherever it raises its hydra head. (Washington correspondence Philadelphia Inquirer.)

Such is the mob spirit which rules at Washington City and throughout the North. If a newspaper has the manliness or independence to oppose the war, or if it dares to advocate the restoration of peace, it is at once mobbed, and the news of the destruction of the freedom of the press is received with rejoicings at Washington, as an evidence of the determination of the masses to crush out treason wherever it raises its hydra head. But, not only are newspapers suppressed by irresponsible mobs, but in Saint Louis, they have been stopped by the military authorities. The telegraph Saturday, announced that the following official order had been promulgated from Washington, relative to the suppression of the New York Journal and Commerce, the Daily News, the Day Book, and the Freeman's Journal; these papers having been recently presented by the Grand Jury as dangerous, from their disloyalty, are no longer to be forwarded in the mails. If carried out, the order will be a virtual suppression of the newspapers named. The following is the official order referred to:

Post-Office Department, Aug. 24.

To the Postmaster at New York: The Postmaster General directs that from and after your receipt of this New York City which were lately presented by the Grand Jury as dangerous from their disloyalty shall be forwarded in the mails.

I am, respectfully, your obedient servant, T. B. TRATT, Chief Clerk.

Such is the official order of the authorities at Washington, which is but the carrying out of the policy of the Lincoln administration. If a Northern man speaks against the war, he is at once arrested; if a newspaper advocates peace it is torn down; if a man or woman is suppressed by military authority; and when these things are done, the act is applauded by Lincoln and his minions throughout the country. What has become of the boasted liberty of speech and of the press in the North? Is the Government waging war to maintain the Constitutional rights of citizens? If so, why does it violate the plain provisions of that instrument. In regard to the liberty of speech and of the press, the Federal Government has no right to interfere.

Apprehensive.

The leaders of the Union party are apprehensive that the State Rights men will precipitate Kentucky into revolution or secession. It is true, they say, that the Secessionists are only a handful of comparatively unarmed men; and the Unionists number not less than one hundred thousand, of whom not less than twenty thousand are armed with Lincoln guns; yet the Unionists are apprehensive. We cannot account for their constant alarm. Have they any misgivings as to the true sentiments of the people of Kentucky? Are they not entirely certain that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

UNION MEN OF KENTUCKY AWAKE.

We learn by private advice from Kentucky that Union men are rapidly receiving alarm. The Unionists are ready, and it is believed that in a few days 20,000 loyal citizens of Kentucky and Eastern Tennessee, from which hundreds of fugitives are fleeing, will be in line. The Legislature, which meets Monday week, will probably declare a state of neutrality, and the people are far ahead of their leaders, by declaring the right of the General Government to maintain the Union, and by opposing Magoffin and inviting Breckinridge and Powell to resign. [New York Tribune.]

We make the above extract from the New York Tribune. It is another evidence of the purposes of the leaders of the Union party in this State. "The pernicious doctrine of neutrality," we are informed, is to be abandoned; the Legislature is to declare that the General Government has the right to march troops through the State; and Magoffin is to be deposed; and Breckinridge and Powell invited to resign.

We do not believe the Legislature will dare attempt to carry out the programme laid out for it by the Tribune. Has the Tribune or the members of the Legislature of Kentucky ever thought that when Lincoln's troops are marched through Kentucky that we shall have war, and that we will interfere materially with any programme that may be fixed up for Kentucky, either in New York or Washington City.

We are surprised at the folly of the leaders of the Union party. They do not seem to realize that the inauguration of war in Kentucky will result in at once uniting Kentucky with the South. Our opponents, in their blindness and folly, are doing more for the Southern Right party in Kentucky, than we are doing for ourselves. It is said "whom the gods intend to destroy they first make mad." It is this, be correct, the Union party in Kentucky is on the swift road to destruction.

We shall soon see, however, whether or not the Tribune speaks by authority. The Commissioners have been sent to Washington and Richmond to ask a recognition of the neutrality of Kentucky. The answer which these Commissioners shall receive will do much to determine the action of the people of Kentucky. If Lincoln refuses to recognize Kentucky neutrality, the people of Kentucky will compel him to respect it. Mark these words.

The London Times on the Battle of Fort Mifflin.

The current has risen for that tragedy which our kinsmen across the Atlantic have prepared for the scandal of free institutions. The battle has been fought, and the result is a common language, and common sympathies. A battle, such as might have happened between men of a common origin, common language, and common sympathies. A battle, such as might have happened between men of a common origin, common language, and common sympathies.

Those events were but the normal condition of a quiet land, and those contests were between men claiming a separate nationality, and those who for the first time have a brotherhood of near hundred years' past assunder by one great schism and joining in a senseless and bloody strife, the war for the restoration of the Southern Republic, the irruption, the quick occupation of territory by force invaders, the desperate attack upon the first stronghold in the West, the surprise, the sudden and overwhelming attack from the hidden enemy, the sudden panic and the headlong flight, with a delirium of the deadly purpose for many sections than in our order battles. They were fought comparatively from safety of heart, from love of fighting, from ideal of right, from first and principally for hope of plunder. A day's hunting on the Chevelons was (excuse the word) as much as a day's war.

This is a decidedly ultra position—especially for the Union-peace-neutrality party. It is a clear abandonment of the principles upon which they have so repeatedly triumphed in Kentucky. They three months ago, if compelled to take sides, or if they discovered that the Administration was waging a war of subjugation against the South—they officially "proclaimed" that they were not counting the costs, Kentucky would promptly unsheathe her sword in behalf of her sister States of the South. Now, instead of unsheathing their swords in behalf of the Southern brethren, the miserable Unionists are denying that they were ever in good faith for neutrality—are now in favor of Kentucky "unofficially" unsheathing her sword for the North.

First, the leaders of the Union party are in favor of resisting the Northern States "at all hazards and to the last extremity," then they were "in favor of making cause with the South," then, for "armed neutrality," then, for paying Lincoln's war tax; then, for importing Lincoln guns and ammunitions into the State; now, they are in favor of waging war against the Southern States, until they are made to yield a willing obedience to the Lincoln Government.

In brief, the leaders of the Union party in Kentucky are at heart in favor of a course of policy that Lincoln may decide upon, and which they will follow, provided, it is thought that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

Editorial Louisville Courier.

Will you permit me through your columns to warn a portion of my fellow-citizens against the folly and danger of a hasty and unwise action? They have recently expressed upon it, and I am sure that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

Editorial Louisville Courier.

Will you permit me through your columns to warn a portion of my fellow-citizens against the folly and danger of a hasty and unwise action? They have recently expressed upon it, and I am sure that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

Editorial Louisville Courier.

Will you permit me through your columns to warn a portion of my fellow-citizens against the folly and danger of a hasty and unwise action? They have recently expressed upon it, and I am sure that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

Editorial Louisville Courier.

Will you permit me through your columns to warn a portion of my fellow-citizens against the folly and danger of a hasty and unwise action? They have recently expressed upon it, and I am sure that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

Editorial Louisville Courier.

Will you permit me through your columns to warn a portion of my fellow-citizens against the folly and danger of a hasty and unwise action? They have recently expressed upon it, and I am sure that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

Editorial Louisville Courier.

Will you permit me through your columns to warn a portion of my fellow-citizens against the folly and danger of a hasty and unwise action? They have recently expressed upon it, and I am sure that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

Editorial Louisville Courier.

Will you permit me through your columns to warn a portion of my fellow-citizens against the folly and danger of a hasty and unwise action? They have recently expressed upon it, and I am sure that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

Editorial Louisville Courier.

Will you permit me through your columns to warn a portion of my fellow-citizens against the folly and danger of a hasty and unwise action? They have recently expressed upon it, and I am sure that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

The London Times on the Battle of Fort Mifflin.

The current has risen for that tragedy which our kinsmen across the Atlantic have prepared for the scandal of free institutions. The battle has been fought, and the result is a common language, and common sympathies. A battle, such as might have happened between men of a common origin, common language, and common sympathies. A battle, such as might have happened between men of a common origin, common language, and common sympathies.

Those events were but the normal condition of a quiet land, and those contests were between men claiming a separate nationality, and those who for the first time have a brotherhood of near hundred years' past assunder by one great schism and joining in a senseless and bloody strife, the war for the restoration of the Southern Republic, the irruption, the quick occupation of territory by force invaders, the desperate attack upon the first stronghold in the West, the surprise, the sudden and overwhelming attack from the hidden enemy, the sudden panic and the headlong flight, with a delirium of the deadly purpose for many sections than in our order battles. They were fought comparatively from safety of heart, from love of fighting, from ideal of right, from first and principally for hope of plunder. A day's hunting on the Chevelons was (excuse the word) as much as a day's war.

This is a decidedly ultra position—especially for the Union-peace-neutrality party. It is a clear abandonment of the principles upon which they have so repeatedly triumphed in Kentucky. They three months ago, if compelled to take sides, or if they discovered that the Administration was waging a war of subjugation against the South—they officially "proclaimed" that they were not counting the costs, Kentucky would promptly unsheathe her sword in behalf of her sister States of the South. Now, instead of unsheathing their swords in behalf of the Southern brethren, the miserable Unionists are denying that they were ever in good faith for neutrality—are now in favor of Kentucky "unofficially" unsheathing her sword for the North.

First, the leaders of the Union party are in favor of resisting the Northern States "at all hazards and to the last extremity," then they were "in favor of making cause with the South," then, for "armed neutrality," then, for paying Lincoln's war tax; then, for importing Lincoln guns and ammunitions into the State; now, they are in favor of waging war against the Southern States, until they are made to yield a willing obedience to the Lincoln Government.

In brief, the leaders of the Union party in Kentucky are at heart in favor of a course of policy that Lincoln may decide upon, and which they will follow, provided, it is thought that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

Editorial Louisville Courier.

Will you permit me through your columns to warn a portion of my fellow-citizens against the folly and danger of a hasty and unwise action? They have recently expressed upon it, and I am sure that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

Editorial Louisville Courier.

Will you permit me through your columns to warn a portion of my fellow-citizens against the folly and danger of a hasty and unwise action? They have recently expressed upon it, and I am sure that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

Editorial Louisville Courier.

Will you permit me through your columns to warn a portion of my fellow-citizens against the folly and danger of a hasty and unwise action? They have recently expressed upon it, and I am sure that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

Editorial Louisville Courier.

Will you permit me through your columns to warn a portion of my fellow-citizens against the folly and danger of a hasty and unwise action? They have recently expressed upon it, and I am sure that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

Editorial Louisville Courier.

Will you permit me through your columns to warn a portion of my fellow-citizens against the folly and danger of a hasty and unwise action? They have recently expressed upon it, and I am sure that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

Editorial Louisville Courier.

Will you permit me through your columns to warn a portion of my fellow-citizens against the folly and danger of a hasty and unwise action? They have recently expressed upon it, and I am sure that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

Editorial Louisville Courier.

Will you permit me through your columns to warn a portion of my fellow-citizens against the folly and danger of a hasty and unwise action? They have recently expressed upon it, and I am sure that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

Editorial Louisville Courier.

Will you permit me through your columns to warn a portion of my fellow-citizens against the folly and danger of a hasty and unwise action? They have recently expressed upon it, and I am sure that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

The London Times on the Battle of Fort Mifflin.

The current has risen for that tragedy which our kinsmen across the Atlantic have prepared for the scandal of free institutions. The battle has been fought, and the result is a common language, and common sympathies. A battle, such as might have happened between men of a common origin, common language, and common sympathies. A battle, such as might have happened between men of a common origin, common language, and common sympathies.

Those events were but the normal condition of a quiet land, and those contests were between men claiming a separate nationality, and those who for the first time have a brotherhood of near hundred years' past assunder by one great schism and joining in a senseless and bloody strife, the war for the restoration of the Southern Republic, the irruption, the quick occupation of territory by force invaders, the desperate attack upon the first stronghold in the West, the surprise, the sudden and overwhelming attack from the hidden enemy, the sudden panic and the headlong flight, with a delirium of the deadly purpose for many sections than in our order battles. They were fought comparatively from safety of heart, from love of fighting, from ideal of right, from first and principally for hope of plunder. A day's hunting on the Chevelons was (excuse the word) as much as a day's war.

This is a decidedly ultra position—especially for the Union-peace-neutrality party. It is a clear abandonment of the principles upon which they have so repeatedly triumphed in Kentucky. They three months ago, if compelled to take sides, or if they discovered that the Administration was waging a war of subjugation against the South—they officially "proclaimed" that they were not counting the costs, Kentucky would promptly unsheathe her sword in behalf of her sister States of the South. Now, instead of unsheathing their swords in behalf of the Southern brethren, the miserable Unionists are denying that they were ever in good faith for neutrality—are now in favor of Kentucky "unofficially" unsheathing her sword for the North.

First, the leaders of the Union party are in favor of resisting the Northern States "at all hazards and to the last extremity," then they were "in favor of making cause with the South," then, for "armed neutrality," then, for paying Lincoln's war tax; then, for importing Lincoln guns and ammunitions into the State; now, they are in favor of waging war against the Southern States, until they are made to yield a willing obedience to the Lincoln Government.

In brief, the leaders of the Union party in Kentucky are at heart in favor of a course of policy that Lincoln may decide upon, and which they will follow, provided, it is thought that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party, as though such an insignificant organization could by any possible means precipitate Kentucky into secession? Perhaps our opponents haven't confidence in the Unionism of so-called Union men; perhaps, they fear that Union men in Kentucky are no better than Union men in Tennessee, Virginia and Missouri—who when the time arrived struck boldly for the South. It may be, after all their bluster, that they haven't a reliable majority of unconditional Unionists in the State? But, be this as it may, the Unionists are apprehensive, and some how or other the State Rights men are bountiful with confidence.

Editorial Louisville Courier.

Will you permit me through your columns to warn a portion of my fellow-citizens against the folly and danger of a hasty and unwise action? They have recently expressed upon it, and I am sure that the public mind is sufficiently educated to enable them to "precipitate" the State into the support of Lincoln's war? Has not Kentucky eminently loyal? Has she not terminated three or four times, by overwhelming majorities, to remain in the Union? Did not her recent vote indicate that her people intended to pay Lincoln's war tax? Why, then, are the leaders of the Union party apprehensive? Why do they exaggerate everything done by the State Rights party







